

City of Greenville Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Greenville Convention Center, Room 102 4:00 PM, July 15, 2021 Meeting Notice Posted July 9, 2021

NOTICE OF MEETING: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, annual notice of this Commission's Meetings was provided on December 31, 2021 via the Greenville City Website. In addition, the Agenda for this Meeting was posted outside the meeting place (City Council Chambers in City Hall) and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice. Notice for the public hearings was published in the Greenville News, posted on the properties subject of public hearing(s), mailed to all surrounding property owners, and emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice pursuant to Section 6-29-760 of the S.C. Code of Laws and Section 19-2.2.9 of the Code of the City of Greenville.

Minutes prepared by Sharon Key and Ross Zelenske

Commissioners Present

Diane Eldridge, Mike Martinez, Jeff Randolph, Derek Enderlin, Trey Gardner and Meg Terry

Commissioners Absent

None

Staff Present

Assistant City Manager Shannon Lavrin, Associate Development Planner Jordan Harris, City Attorney Mike Pitts, Community Planner Monique Mattison (virtual), Development Planner Austin Rutherford, Development Planner Harold Evangelista, Development Planner Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner Ross Zelenske, Interim City Engineer Clint Link, Landscape Architect Hannah Slyce, Planning Administrator Courtney Powell, Planning and Development Services Director Jonathan B. Graham, Principal Development Planner Kristopher Kurjiaka, Principal Landscape Architect Edward Kinney, and Strategic Communications Administrator MJ Simpson (virtual)

Call to Order

Chairwoman Meg Terry called the meeting to order at 4:03 PM. Chairwoman Terry provided normal beginning procedures for Commission meeting. She explained the agenda of the Planning Commission, outlined the rules for procedure, and invited the other commissioners to introduce themselves.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Jeff Randolph moved to approve minutes as proposed for the following meetings. Commissioner Derek Enderlin seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

• June 9, 2021 Special Called Workshop

- June 15, 2021 Workshop
- June 17, 2021 Public Hearing

Call for Affidavits from Applicants

Staff reported that all public notice affidavits were received. Staff noted that two applications had requested deferral.

Acceptance of Agenda

Chairperson Meg Terry recuses herself in the vote to accept deferral of MD-21-506 Commissioner Derek Enderlin motioned to approve, Commissioner Trey Gardner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Derek Enderlin motioned to approve the agenda with removal of previous items, Commissioner Trey Gardner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Conflicts of Interest

None

OLD BUSINESS

A. FDP-21-216 Application deferred to the August 19, 2021 meeting

Application by Stone Property Management LLC for a **MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT** and **FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN** on 5.278 total acres located at **HOWE ST AND HAYNIE ST** for 179 apartment units (TM# 009101-08-01400, 009101-08-01500, 009101-08-01600, 009101-08-01601, 009101-08-01603, 009101-08-01700, 009101-08-01800, 009101-08-01900, 009101-08-02000, 009101-08-02100, 009101-08-02200, 009101-08-02300, 009101-08-02400, 009101-08-02500, 009101-08-02700, 009101-08-02701, 009101-08-02702, 009101-08-02703, 009101-08-02704, 009101-08-02705, 009101-08-02800, 009101-08-03000)

No discussion as the applicant requested to defer the application.

NEW BUSINESS

A. AX-3-2021

Application by Flournoy Development Group for **ANNEXATION** of 0.536 acre of street right-of-way of **GLADYS DR** from Greenville County to the City of Greenville (in front of TM# 0260000100400)

Staff report presented by Development Planner Ross Zelenske

Development Planner Ross Zelenske read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

None

Applicant Presentation

 David Graffius with Gray Engineering speaks as the applicant. He explains the reasoning for this latest plan change. He offers to answer any questions.

Public comments

None

Commission Discussion

None

*Motion: Commissioner Trey Gardner moved to recommend approval with staff comments for AX-3-2021. Seconded by Commissioner Derek Enderlin. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0 vote.

B. Z-26-2021

Application by Greenville Technical College for a **REZONE** of 13.97 acres located at **N PLEASANTBURG DRIVE, SKYVIEW DRIVE, AND WINTERBERRY COURT** from C-3, Regional commercial district, to OD, Office and institutional district (TM# 00267000100306, 0269000101104, 0269000101107, 0269000101102, 0269000103101, 0269000103601, 0269000108800, 0269000101109)

Staff report presented by Development Planner Ross Zelenske

Development Planner Ross Zelenske read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

None

<u>Applicant Presentation</u>

 Jacqueline DiMaggio, Vice President of Finance for Greenville Technical College speaks as the applicant. She explains the reasoning for the zoning request and offers to answer any questions.

Public comments

None

Commission Discussion

None

*Motion: Commissioner Mike Martinez moved to recommend approval with staff comments of Z-26-2021. Seconded by Commissioner Derek Enderlin. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

C. MD-21-506 Application deferred to the August 19, 2021 meeting

Application by Stanley Martin Homes for a **MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT** on approximately 3.88 acres located at **GIBBS STREET AND WESTFIELD STREET** for 104 condominium units ("Wimbledon Heights") (TM# 0051000300100, 0051000300400, 0051000300500, 0051000300600, 0051000300700, 0051000300800, 0051000300900, 0051000301000, 0051000301100, 0051000301200, 0051000301300, 0051000301400, 0051000301500, 0051000301600)

No discussion as the applicant requested to defer the application.

D. SD-21-511

Application by Chosen Generation Properties for a **SUBDIVISION** of 0.51 acre located at **102 POTOMAC AVENUE** from 1 lot to 3 lots (TM# 0211000802800)

Staff report presented by Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka

Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

None

Applicant Presentation

None

Public comments

None

Commission Discussion

None

*Motion: Commissioner Trey Gardner moved to approve SD-21-511 with staff comments and conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Jeff Randolph. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

E. Z-28-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section(s) 19-1.11 and 19-6.1 of the City's Land Management Ordinance to define the term 'adaptive reuse', create eligibility criteria for adaptive reuse projects, and reduce minimum parking requirements for eligible adaptive reuse projects.

Staff report presented by Planning Administrator Courtney Powell

Planning Administrator Courtney Powell read through the staff report.

Public comments

None

Commission Discussion

None

*Motion: Commissioner Jeff Randolph moved to recommend Z-28-2021 for approval with staff comments. Seconded by Commissioner Diane Eldridge. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

F. Z-29-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section(s) 19-2.2.4 and 19-2.2.7 of the City's Land Management Ordinance to update the neighborhood meeting standards and requirements for public hearing applications.

Staff report presented by Planning Administrator Courtney Powell

Planning Administrator Courtney Powell read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

- Commissioner Jeff Randolph asked if there is an application that requires a public hearing but did not require a neighborhood meeting, that the chairperson could request one and defer the application.
 - o Planning Administrator Courtney Powell confirms that his understanding is correct.
- Commissioner Randolph also asked if that if a project had a neighborhood meeting, but the chairperson determined, at the public hearing, that another neighborhood meeting was needed, they could require one.
 - Courtney Powell responded that the applicant could agree to defer and host the meeting, or they could take their chances with a decision from the Commission that day.

Public comments

None

Commission Discussion

None

*Motion: Commissioner Derek Enderlin moved to recommend Z-29-2021 for approval with staff comments. Seconded by Commissioner Trey Gardner. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Staff Update

- West End Small Area Plan
 - Development Planner Austin Rutherford provides an update.
- Village of West Greenville Small Area Plan
 - Development Planner Harold Evangelista provides an update.
- Land Management Ordinance
 - Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka provides an update.

B. Upcoming Dates:

August 17, 2021 – PC Workshop August 19, 2021 – PC Public Hearing

Adjourned at 4:32 PM

STATEMENT OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

TO:	Chairperson or Presiding Officer of the Planning Commission		
FROM	: Meg Terry		
	(Commission Member=s Name)		
descril	nt to South Carolina Code Section 8-13-700(b), I make this statement concerning the matter ed below, action or decision upon which will directly affect an economic interest as contemplated Ethics, Government Accountability Campaign Reform Act of 1991:		
A.	The matter requiring action or decision is as follows:		
	Meeting Date: 15 July 2021		
	Agenda Item No.: MD-21-506 Subject: Wimbledon Heights / Gibbs & Hyde		
	Agenda Item No.:Subject:		
	Agenda Item No.:Subject:		
B.	The nature of my potential conflict is as follows:		
	I have an economic interest which will be affected by the action.		
	A member of my immediate family has an economic interest which will be directly affected.		
	An individual with whom I am associated has an economic interest which will be affected.		
X	A business with which I am associated has an economic interest which will be affected.		
	by withdraw from any votes, deliberation or other actions on this matter and request that qualification and the grounds therefore be noted in the minutes.		
Date:	14 July 2021 Signature: Signature:		
	F LIAISON SHALL NOTE THIS ABSTENTION AND THE ABOVE GROUNDS IE MINUTES. THIS STATEMENT SHALL BE ATTACHED TO THE MINUTES.		
	Chairperson or Presiding Officer		

Ross Zelenske

From: Aaron Barr <aaron.lee.barr@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 13, 2021 11:19 AM **To:** Planning; Calin Owens; Ross Zelenske

Subject: Public comment - Westfield/Hyde/Gibbs development

Attachments: Barr Comments_Westfield_MD-21-506.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or opening attachments.

Hello,

I've attached some comments regarding the planned development MD-21-506

I'm requesting the following changes/considerations for this development:

- 1. Add a sidewalk on the North side of Hyde
- 2. Reduce or eliminate on-street parking
- 3. Preserve or replace heritage trees
- 4. Future roundabout planning

I will also plan to attend the in-person public hearing on Thursday.

Thanks,

Aaron Barr

109 Butler Avenue cell: 540.239.0974 Chair - Green Ribbon Advisory Committee Board Member - Bike Walk Greenville Aaron Barr 109 Butler Avenue Greenville, SC 29601 07/13/2021

Greenville City Planning Commission ATTN: Ross Zelenske City of Greenville 206 South Main Street Greenville, SC 29601

Dear Greenville City Planning Commission:

My children attend AJ Whittenburg elementary school and I bike them to school every day down Hyde Street in order to avoid the homeless shelter and the steep grades and high traffic of Westfield and Hudson. The proposed development is an improvement that will increase safety, reduce vagrancy and relocate the Willimon tow trucks that are constantly speeding on our street.

However, I have four suggested changes to the development as proposed:

- 1. Add sidewalks on Hyde
- 2. Reduce or eliminate on-street parking
- 3. Preserve or replace heritage trees
- 4. Future roundabout planning

Sidewalks – Please add a sidewalk on the north side of Hyde Street. The plan has 6 on-street parking spots on this side of the street, on Greenville Water property. This would require relocating two sets of 3-phase power lines and demolishing the original historic granite curb. A sidewalk on this side of the street is the safest route to school for my children, particularly as this block experiences an increase in vehicle traffic. When Greenville Water was planning their campus, we requested sidewalks on Hyde. We were told at a neighborhood meeting and public hearings that any future sidewalks on Hyde would be contingent upon the nature of development on this block. Now that the block is being redeveloped, there should be sidewalks on both sides of this street that will serve as a gateway to Unity park from downtown and surrounding neighborhoods.

On-street parking - In addition to removing these 6 on-street parking spots, I suggest reducing or eliminating other on-street parking. The Greenville Water campus has a massive underutilized parking deck across the street from this development that is completely empty on evenings and weekends that could accommodate guests and visitors and eliminate the need for any additional on-street parking. Additional on-street parking was added to Wesfield that is never fully utilized.

Greenville City Planning Commission 07/13/2021 Page 2

The proposed development has 250 parking spots planned, well above the 156-space minimum requirement, including 42 on-street parking spots that are taking valuable real estate away from the pedestrian realm. If these spots were removed, wider sidewalks and increased tree cover could be added.

Heritage trees - I walked the property last week and counted 20 heritage trees, primarily valuable hardwoods of Pecan and Oak. My father marks timber for a living, so I know that this is some valuable lumber that the developer will be taking off this property. Some of the trees have been badly mismanaged and need to be removed, but many of them are in great shape and all of them should be subject to the new tree ordinance that went into effect on July 1st. I have serious doubts that the 26 small hardwoods and 40 ornamental trees that are planned will replace the majestic oaks and pecans that are currently on this property.

Roundabout planning — Over the past 4 years, I've been told by multiple people, including former city staff, developers and planning consultants that a round-about is possible and planned for Broad street at this complex intersection. Navigating the intersection of Broad, McBee, Westfield and Hyde is very difficult as a biker and pedestrian due to the high traffic volumes, constantly turning traffic, poor visibility and high speeds. A roundabout at this intersection would help to slow traffic, improve safety and better utilize the top of Prospect Hill. I ask that the developer and traffic engineering team consider the location and entry points for a future roundabout as they plan this development.

Sincerely,

Aaron Barr

Chair – Green Ribbon Advisory Committee

Board Member – Bike Walk Greenville

Land Management Ordinance Round 3 Text Amendments

Text Amendment: Adaptive Reuse

Project Engagement

VIEWS	PARTICIPANTS
10	1
RESPONSES	COMMENTS
0	1

Please share your questions or comments on this proposal.

Good idea. Next step, feel free to get rid of all parking minimums, not just for adaptive reuses. 4 days ago

Text Amendment: Neighborhood Meetings

Project Engagement

VIEWS	PARTICIPANTS
11	6
RESPONSES	COMMENTS
0	8

Please share your questions or comments on this proposal.

I strongly approve of this amendment. I would also suggest that statement that details a minimum attendance of parties representing the affected neighborhood. Below that attendance level the applicant must schedule an additional meeting. A maximum of 2 meetings should be sufficient to allow for any concerned parties to participate.

53 minutes ago

I am in agreement with this proposal to extend the neighborhood meeting requirement. Protecting Greenville neighborhoods is important to the quality of life and to the strength of the Greenville community. Residents should be aware and have the opportunity to participate in these decisions that so directly impact us. All of the work that has been done to build these communities with thoughtful planning should be protected and decisions made with input and ideas from those residents directly impacted so that there is balance between neighborhood preservation and economic growth.

19 hours ago

This requirement of neighborhood meetings for multi-family dwellings seems counterintuitive to the housing crisis the city has especially in terms of affordable housing. I understand trying to balance the push back of the NIMBY crowd with the need for affordable housing so perhaps this needs to be better defined i.e. focused on the number of units. I think that a way to balance the needs of both sides on this issue would be to change the meeting requirement to only developments with more than 5 units in one lot. This would allow for the development of duplexes and fourplexes that could help fit the cities growing housing needs while maintaining the neighborhood atmosphere.

yesterday

This is a terrible idea. This is just empowering NIMBYs. We all know where these lead. Why does everything have to be by committee and public meetings? You know the net result of this is just going to be less development, and more importantly, LESS HOUSING. Less housing equals more homelessness; less housing equals less affordability; less housing hurts the poor. Whose idea was this? Terrible. Why are the neighborhood meetings only related to multi-family uses? Why are single-family uses always raised up to a higher level of privilege?

4 days ago

- 1. I like this but would prefer slightly more specific text on what happens if a neighborhood votes "NO" as a group. What impact will their vote have. I understand a neighborhood may not be able to veto a project, but perhaps a NO vote will mandate a second review process, or an additional meeting. Burger King initially got a NO vote by the WGVL neighborhood association before changing site plans to move the building and parking lot and avoid RDV mandated feedback. It was legal, but community members were baffled when they learned their initial NO vote had no bearing on the ultimate approval of the project.
- 2. The signage indicating a neighborhood meeting over a project and the accompanying mailers are not enough. I don't have a solution, but too many people toss the letter and don't understanding the meaning of the board review sign.

4 days ago

I like this but would prefer slightly more specific text on what happens if a neighborhood votes "NO" as a group. What impact will their vote have. I understand a neighborhood may not be able to veto a project, but perhaps a NO vote will mandate a second review process, or an additional meeting. Burger King initially got a NO vote by the WGVL neighborhood association before changing site plans to move the building and parking lot and avoid RDV mandated feedback. It was legal, but community members were baffled when they learned their initial NO vote had no bearing on the ultimate approval of the project.

4 days ago

I enthusiastically support this text amendment as it ensures developer transparency with local residents and other key stakeholders.

4 days ago

I enthusiastically support this text amendment as it requires developers to be more transparent!